

Note for Keane, Denise

From: Murphy, Virginia
Date: Tue, Sep 28, 1993 12:37 PM
Subject: RE: Records Management Meeting
To: Keane, Denise

Sure - I took the position that legal concerns were limited to those articulated in Clare's memo (which I reviewed before she distributed it) and that extensive legal involvement was due solely to our being most logical victim charged with researching substantive retention requirements in state and federal legislation. I told them we have absolutely no objection to streamlining administrative procedures and that there is no legal obstacle to implementation of practical business decisions (ie written reports of destruction and other compliance elements in lieu of extensive audits). Our primary objective was implementation of a system encompassing legal and business requirements with good faith compliance standards.

The group started out blaming legal but calmed down pretty quickly. They admitted that they had no strong desire to centralize or change the administrative aspects of the program but were extremely discouraged by the lack of upper management support.

I volunteered me or others in legal to communicate to upper management, upon request, what we view as the risks of non-compliance (inability to defend/respond coherently to discovery/ obligation to search for and produce documents we need not have retained, etc.). The group agreed to look into the costs associated with retaining documents in the absence of an obligation to do so (storage, increased time to locate relevant documents, etc).

From: Keane, Denise on Tue, Sep 28, 1993 12:14 PM
Subject: Records Management Meeting
To: Murphy, Virginia

Could you at some point let me know what transpired at your meeting in Richmond on the 21st and what position was advocated on behalf of the Legal Department.

Thanks.

2041242926

2041242926A

2041242926-A